

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action of April 17, 2008. Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-24 and 27-29 are pending. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are amended by this response. No new matter is submitted and support for the amendments can be found at least in paragraphs [0048], [0053] and [0055].

### I Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,559,867 ("Kotick") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,469,714 ("Buxton") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,659 ("Govindarajan") in even further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,263,668 ("Lentz"). The Office Action rejected Claims 14-15 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Kotick in view of Buxton in further view of Govindarajan in even further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,931,783 ("Atkinson"). The Office Action rejected Claims 16-17, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over Kotick in view of Buxton in further view of Govindarajan in even further view of Atkinson in still even further view of Lentz. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kotick discloses a configuration system for networked training modules. Kotick describes using a toolbar 50 and a toolbar 70 to select a desired training module icon, such as icon 72 (col. 5, lines 17-30; FIGS. 2, 3, and 4H). The selected training module icon may be dragged to a workstation representation, such as workstation 61, in virtual space 60 to have the training module copied to the workstation (col. 5, lines 29-38; FIGS. 4H-4I). The Office Action states that Kotick discloses displaying a palette in conjunction with the electronic document on a user interface such that the palette and an active associated content of the palette does not obscure viewing of the electronic document. Specifically, the Office Action refers to Fig. 2, items 51-53, Fig. 3, items 71-81 and column 5, lines 15-30 to support this contention. However, Kotick merely

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 09/770,337

Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01

Filing Date: January 26, 2001

discloses buttons or icons, which when activated are not shown to increase at all in size. In contrast, a pop-up menu or other pull down box increases in size and would intrude into the electronic document viewing area of Kotick.

Buxton discloses a user interface for applets. Buxton discloses a desktop 300 including an infocenter 320. Infocenter 320 includes action bar 322. Action bar 322 includes action items 324 and main menu items 326 (col. 6, lines 59-67; FIGS. 3A-D and 4A-D). However, similar to Kotick, Buxton does not disclose or suggest that an activated pop-up menu or other pull down box can be displayed without obscuring the electronic viewing area. To the contrary, Figs. 3C and 4B illustrate a pop-up menu occluding the electronic document.

Govindarajan discloses a data processing system for electronic business cards. The electronic business cards, or web pages, can have icons representing different contact methods, and a user can remove an icon from his or her card as the user desires. However, like Kotick and Buxton, Govindarajan does not disclose or suggest an activated pop-up menu or other pull down box being displayed without obscuring the electronic document viewing area.

Lentz discloses an interface in which icons representing users are displayed on one area and a menu of selectable items are displayed on another area. However, like Kotick, Buxton and Govindarajan, Lentz does not disclose or suggest an activated pop-up menu or other pull down box being displayed without obscuring an electronic document.

Atkinson discloses a system for removing a sub-menu from a menu. However, like Kotick, Buxton, Govindarajan and Lentz, Atkinson does not disclose or suggest an activated pop-up menu or other pull down box being displayed without obscuring an electronic document.

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 09/770,337

Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01

Filing Date: January 26, 2001

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited art, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests that displaying a palette in conjunction with an electronic document on a user interface includes sizing the palette and resizing the displayed electronic document to accommodate the palette so that the palette and the electronic document are simultaneously viewable such that said palette and an activated associated content of the palette do not obscure viewing of said electronic document, the activated associated content of the palette being a pop-up menu or pull down box, wherein the displayed palette excludes displayed controls for the unavailable properties for the electronic document.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentably distinguished from any combination of Kotick, Buxton Govindarajan, Atkinson and/or Lentz and are in condition for allowance. For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 14 and 27 and their respective dependent claims are patentably distinguished from any combination of Kotick, Buxton Govindarajan, Atkinson and/or Lentz and are in condition for allowance.

## **II In-Person Interview of July 16, 2008**

Applicants thank Examiner Ke for meeting with Applicants' representative, MacLane Key, at 1:30 PM on July 16, 2008. The amendments made by this response were discussed, and though a further search will be required, Examiner Ke seemed to agree the claims as amended by this response overcome the art of record.

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 09/770,337

Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01

Filing Date: January 26, 2001

### III M.P.E.P. §707.07(j)

M.P.E.P. §707.07(j) states:

“...If the examiner is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, the examiner may note in the Office action that certain aspects or features of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims may be given favorable consideration...”

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make Applicants aware of any subject matter disclosed by the present application which the Examiner believes is patentable. By doing so, the Examiner would help expedite prosecution by enabling Applicants to amend the present claims or draft new claims directed to such subject matter.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Application Number: 09/770,337

Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01

Filing Date: January 26, 2001

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Date: July 17, 2008

By: /MacLane C. Key/

MacLane C. Key, Reg. No.: 48,250  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct telephone (703) 647-6566  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**  
**(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

July 17, 2008  
Date

/Ibjen Samom/  
Ibjen Samom

Type of Response: AMENDMENT under 37 C.F.R. 1.111  
Application Number: 09/770,337  
Attorney Docket Number: 150899.01  
Filing Date: January 26, 2001